

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ZENAIDA HERNANDEZ, )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,           )  
v.                     ) CIVIL ACTION  
                        )  
NO. 12-11062-FDS  
MARIA E. MONTANEZ, et al., )  
                        )  
Defendants.          )

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER AND  
ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL**

This matter is before the court on the “Plaintiff’s Motion for a Protective Order” (Docket No. 17) and on the “Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Answers to Interrogatories” (Docket No. 18). After consideration of the parties’ submissions and their oral arguments, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

1. The plaintiff’s motion for a protective order is ALLOWED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. By **May 20, 2013**, the parties shall file a joint protective order in accordance with the parameters described in open court.
2. The plaintiff’s motion to compel is ALLOWED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as follows:
  - a. With respect to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 3 and 4, each of the defendants shall provide his/her height and weight, as well as a 5-year age span (e.g., 45-55 years old), which encompasses his/her present age. In addition, each of the defendants shall provide a generic description of any educational degrees that he/she earned, and a generic description of any jobs held prior to employment with the DOC.

- b. The defendants shall supplement their response to Interrogatory No. 15 in order to describe the events leading up to the request to consent to a strip search through the events surrounding the request for approval to conduct the search. In connection with their response, the defendants shall identify the person(s) who gave the approval to perform the search after the plaintiff's consent was obtained.
- c. The parties have reached agreement with respect to Document Request No. 2. Therefore, the motion to compel a response to that Request is denied as moot.
- d. With respect to Document Request Nos. 6 and 8, the defendants shall produce the visitor cards, but may redact them to leave only the names and dates. The plaintiff's motion to compel further information relating to the strip search log is denied without prejudice to renewal if appropriate at a later point in the litigation.
- e. With respect to Document Request Nos. 7 and 9, the defendants shall produce, subject to the protective order, documents concerning any inmate history on which they relied to support the strip search, as well as documents relating to Mr. Jackson's altercation on the day prior to the plaintiff's visit.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/ s / Judith Gail Dein  
Judith Gail Dein  
United States Magistrate Judge

DATED: May 13, 2013